LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of Labour Unity
Founded 1921
Editor: R. Palme Dutt

They First Make Mad ★ R.P.D.

Tactics in the Wage Fight ★ Peter Kerrigan

Trying to Save Europe ★ Quæstor

How the Poor Relieve the Rich ★ Katherine Hood

Towards an Economic Crisis in the U.S.A. ★ Eugene Varga

Portrait of a Ruling Class ★ Monica Felton

March, 1954
One shilling and sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LABOUR PARLIAMENT

ONE HUNDRED YEARS AGO this month the Queen stood on the palace balcony one fine morning, watching the Scots Fusiliers march off to die in the Crimea. She described the scene in a letter the same night, noting that 'they cheered Us *very heartily*.' At Westminster, Parliament could abandon 'for the duration' the Reform Bill, now less urgently needed, in the war atmosphere.

But in the dispute-bound industrial North there was a different scene. At the People's Institute, Manchester, representatives of 'the other nation' met to open the Chartist Labour Parliament, on March 6, 1854. Early on, the chairman read a letter from a distinguished man who had been invited to be present: 'It is the working millions of Great Britain who first have laid down the real basis of a new society—modern industry, which transformed the destructive agencies of nature into the productive power of man . . . multiplying its fruits to such a degree as to make general abundance possible.' Now these same English working classes, with their 'invincible energies', the letter continued, 'have to free those wealth-producing powers from the infamous shackles of monopoly and subject them to the joint control of the producers.' For, he declared, 'The labouring classes have conquered nature, they have now to conquer men.' Thus it was that the name of Dr. Karl Marx was added as founding member to those of the millhands of Lancashire, Cheshire and Yorkshire, the bootmakers and lacemakers from Nottingham, the engineers from Birmingham and London. All the Delegates had been campaigning for the weavers, in the sixth month of the Preston Lockout. As their journal put it: 'The employers have said to the employed: "Each increasing cheapness shall be taken out of your wages—each additional expense of mine your wages shall make up." It is now time for the employed to say: *"Pay out of your profits!"*' On page 110 you will find that Peter Kerrigan a hundred years later gives the very same message. How close to us seem those men and women of 1854!

'My Duty'

TODAY I got a letter from a West country subscriber whose family holds dear the memory of their Chartist trade union forebears. He is a loco fireman and he writes: *'As a trade union branch secretary and an active member of the Labour Party, I feel it is my duty to show your magazine to the thinking members of the Labour movement in this area; and I hope in the future that I may enrol new readers.'* He thinks L.M. 'a first-class labour magazine and I feel it has considerable influence over the whole movement.'

For the second month running some of the most interesting letters

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXVI, No. 3

CONTENTS

March, 1954

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: They First Make Mad, by R.P.D.	97
TACTICS IN THE WAGE FIGHT, by Peter Kerrigan	110
TRYING TO SAVE EUROPE, by Quæstor	117
HOW THE POOR RELIEVE THE RICH, by Katherine Hood	125
TOWARDS AN ECONOMIC CRISIS IN THE U.S.A., by Eugene Varga	130
PORTRAIT OF A RULING CLASS, by Monica Felton	137
ILLUSTRATION: The Paris Commune, 1871	120-121
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO	136
Book Reviews:	
Marx and Engels on Malthus, by R. L. Meek: *M.H.D.*	142
Rising Tide, by Jack Lindsay: *Ted Dickens*	144

Notes of the Month

They First Make Mad

Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad.

ALTHOUGH the Four Power Conference at Berlin has still to reach completion at the time of writing, the outcome of the first three weeks has sufficiently demonstrated its general character. If any hopes were held in any quarter of rapid or easy settlements, such hopes have been disappointed. Nevertheless, the Great Discussion has opened. The alternative policies for the future of Europe and of world peace have been set out with inescapable clearness. It is for the peoples of Europe and the world to carry forward the discussion. The twelfth hour has not yet sounded. The rearmament of German Nazism and militarism is not yet accomplished. It is not yet ratified in France or Italy. The partition of Europe into two hostile armed camps confronting one another across a partitioned Germany is not yet final and inevitable. But the menace is manifest. To prevent this outcome, with all the consequences which could flow from it, will require a very greatly intensified effort. The failure of agreement at Berlin on the key

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

questions of war or peace in Europe has left a grave situation. But it is for the peoples of Europe to say the last word. The present grave situation calls for the most active response to ensure that the path of negotiation, begun at Berlin, is not abandoned, but is carried forward in the most serious spirit to reach a constructive outcome in accordance with the wishes of the people of the entire world for peace.

Two Policies

What are the two alternative policies revealed at Berlin for Europe and the world? The first is the American policy of Dulles; for Eden and Bidault were only ciphers and echoes of Dulles, not daring to depart in a single jot or tittle from his line. The second is the European peace policy voiced by the Soviet Foreign Minister; for the Soviet proposals in fact corresponded to the demands, demonstrated in public opinion polls and every other test, of the majority of the population in France, in Italy, in Britain, in both parts of Germany,* and in the other countries of Europe. The American policy calls for the continuance and extension of the cold war as the central principle of international relations; for the maintenance and further building up of the Atlantic military coalition; for the arming of Adenauer, alongside Franco, Chiang and Rhee; for the consequent partition of Germany and of Europe; for the exclusion of China from the United Nations and consequent disruption of the United Nations as an instrument of peace; and for the launching of a total atomic war whenever any working class or popular struggle in any country in any continent is defined by a nervous State Department or Pentagon as 'communist aggression'. The European peace policy calls for the replacement of the cold war and political bans on trade by international co-operation and the maximum development of international trade; for the replacement of sectional military coali-

*The attitude of the population in Berlin and the two parts of Germany during the Four Power Conference was significant. All the openly proclaimed and daily announced attempts from the side of the Western powers to stir up demonstrations in East Berlin or in the rest of the Democratic Republic against the Soviet proposals for a peaceful united Germany ended in fiasco: Reuter's correspondent on February 10, after a full and unrestricted investigation, testified to the universal support for the Soviet peace proposals for Germany and the voluntary character of the 10½ million signatures expressing that support. On the other hand, in Western Berlin and the rest of Western Germany under the jackboot of Adenauer reaction popular demonstrations (admitted by *The Times* to be 'large') against E.D.C. and Nazi rearmament were treated as illegal and the demonstrators arrested:

> 'A large group of people . . . tried to stage an illegal demonstration in the Karl Marx Strasse in the United States' sector. Eight men and one woman were arrested. The demonstrators carried sandwich boards on which were written such slogans as "Down with the E.D.C. Treaty" '.
>
> (*The Times*, February 13, 1954.)

Thus the 'free' Germans of Adenauer-Germany were being arrested wholesale for the 'illegal' crime of expressing political opinions or supporting peace at the very moment when Eden and Dulles were making their hypocritical speeches about 'free choice' and 'free elections' for Germany.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions by collective security; for a peaceful democratic Germany which shall not be tied to any military coalition; for collective security of a united Europe as a regional pact within the framework of the United Nations; and for the co-operation of the five leading Powers, as laid down by the United Nations Charter, to make effective the functioning of the United Nations for peace, ban atomic bombs and weapons of mass destruction, and reduce armaments. Such are the two policies set out at Berlin. The choice is before us.

Suicidal Folly

Which policy corresponds to the true interests of the people of Britain? Or of France? Or, for that matter, of the United States? Can there be any doubt of the answer? The behaviour of the Western representatives at the Four Power Conference reached a depth of suicidal folly which it would be hard to parallel. Having made the fatal—and public—decision beforehand to treat Berlin as only a propaganda forum, to be accepted as a tedious make-believe formality, before going forward with their prior fixed and rigid programme for rearming German militarism and incorporating a rearmed Western Germany in the Atlantic military coalition, they were caught helpless and unprepared before each succeeding constructive proposal which was put before them for peace and security in Europe or in the world. Tied by Bermuda, they were unable to negotiate. To each succeeding constructive proposal they were only able to reply parrot-fashion with their set piece about so-called 'free elections' (really, American-controlled Hitlerite elections) as the fig-leaf for their policy of rearming German Nazism and militarism, and keeping Germany divided and Europe divided into two armed camps. With each repetition of their gramophone record the fig-leaf grew thinner, and the ugly reality plainer to all. While the Soviet representative showed infinite flexibility and resource in endeavouring patiently and indefatigably to negotiate with a stone wall—first offering proposals for a united peaceful Germany, and then, when these were rejected, showing the path to protect peace and security in Europe, even while Germany was temporarily divided—the Western representatives did not budge an inch from their initial position throughout the proceedings. In the long-term significance of Berlin, the cast-iron militarist diplomacy of the West has been hopelessly outmanoeuvred by socialist diplomacy. Under other circumstances the spectacle of three pigmy robots confronted with a living man might have been entertaining. Unfortunately the fate of all of us is involved in the outcome.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Peace Through Strength'?

It is necesary to judge the Four Power Conference in a wider context against the background of the real relation of forces throughout the world. The fatal error of the Western representatives lay in their assumption that they are still the masters of the world, able to lay down their terms beforehand at Bermuda, and dictate and impose these same chosen terms at Berlin, in place of negotiating as equals with equals, in the search for a compromise and peaceful co-existence. They have judged every Soviet approach only from the standpoint how far it made 'concessions' to the Western aims; they have seen in every Soviet initiative for peace a sign of weakness, not of strength. Their favourite formula is 'peace from strength'; or, as Ernest Bevin once expressed it, the Western powers must determine the kind of world they want and then be strong enough to see they get it. It is obvious that this is not a formula for peace, but for prolonged and intensified cold war, leading to world war.

Obsolete Assumptions

They have based this assumption of superiority, this cool belief that they can dictate their terms like world victors, providing only they 'hold firm', keep on rearming and give nothing away, on a series of factors which are more and more obviously invalid. They have based it on their machine control of the United Nations Assembly, when every vote has more and more clearly revealed that their machine majority represents a minority of the populations of the world, with the majority of the peoples ranged against them. They have based it on the supposed overwhelming preponderance of human and material resources of the Atlantic colony-owning powers, when in fact that paper preponderance is based on colonial and semi-colonial populations who are in increasingly open revolt against their masters, while the European nations ranged in the American Atlantic coalition are more and more openly challenging the American domination and war policy. They have based it on their gigantic multiplication of armaments and armed forces, to something like treble the numbers of the armed forces of the socialist world, and many times more the expenditure, when precisely this insensate drain on their manpower and resources is crippling the economy of the capitalist world. They have based it on the picture of overwhelming superiority of American economic strength, at the very moment when American economy is moving into crisis, while the extent and rate of economic advance of the socialist world

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leaves no doubt of the future. They have based it on an imaginary monopoly of atomic weapons, and on 'superman' dreams of invincible horror weapons and 'press-button' warfare to crush any enemy, when in fact the monopoly does not exist, and the fallacy of the armchair dreams of 'press-button' warfare has long been admitted by every strategist, and was indeed demonstrated in the try-out aggression of the Korean war.

Delusions of Grandeur

Thus the entire current Western (more correctly, American plus satellite) strategy, which received its supreme expression of frozen immobile cast-iron rigidity at Berlin—Nazi rearmament, E.D.C., N.A.T.O., and to hell with any suggestion of a compromise—is based on invalid assumptions which bear no relation to current world realities. Not a single Western representative at Berlin showed the slightest inkling of awareness of these plain facts of the world situation. The delusions of grandeur which beset Hitler have been reincarnated in the Lords of the Atlantic Pact. Mr. Dulles celebrated his departure for Berlin by a would-be blood-curdling speech on January 12, hurling bellicose threats of all-out atomic war in every quarter of the world ('we need to be ready to fight in the Arctic and in the tropics, in Asia, the Near East and in Europe, by sea, by land and by air, and with new weapons') like a mythical Jupiter Omnipotens brandishing his thunderbolts.

Dreaming on the Edge of the Precipice

Mr. Eden and M. Bidault recited their pieces of pre-fabricated doctrinaire formulas, like schoolboys under the eye of their master, or like manipulated puppets in a vacuum, cosily sealed off from the facts of life. Nazism? German militarism over-running Europe? 1940? The solemn vows of 1942 or 1945 that British-French-Soviet co-operation will keep Germany disarmed and maintain peace in Europe? Or the admissions in parliament, at the very moment of Berlin, that the American atom bombers placed Britain in 'the front line' of danger? Not a hint of all this in Berlin. Not a breath of the real world invaded the pompous speeches of the Western representatives at Berlin. In other words, not a breath of statesmanship. For if they had recognised the plain truth of the present world situation, that there is not the slightest possibility of one-sided imposing of terms, and that rival sectional rearmament is no solution, but, on the contrary, the path to destruction, then

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain and France in the first place, and even the United States, would have seized with both hands the opportunity to negotiate for a real compromise as the only path corresponding to their own vital interests. Instead, they preferred to remain as blind and rigid statues, mechanically repeating 'impossible' to every compromise proposal, hugging their dreams of docile Nazi legions and invincible horror weapons, and entirely unaware that their 'firm stand' is in reality the slide down to the precipice.

Atomic Bombastes Furioso

On the very eve of Berlin, Field Marshal Montgomery from his Fontainebleau headquarters was proclaiming the Western aims of atomic war:

> I would never refuse any weapon. . . . I hope that if anyone attacked us we would use everything we had at the outset. . . . I think you can assume, if war starts, that both sides if they have got atomic weapons will use them.

Hard practical soldierly common sense? For Britain, the country most vulnerable to atomic war? 'At the outset'—*i.e.*, not in retaliation, if the other side uses atomic weapons. Montgomery chooses to ignore the fact that the Soviet Government accepted the declaration submitted by the World Peace Movement, to undertake not to use atomic bombs first—a declaration refused by the Western Governments. Atomic war is the Western strategy—not the chosen strategy of 'both sides'.

Mastodons of the R.A.F.

Similarly Marshal of the R.A.F. Sir John Slessor, broadcasting in the very midst of the Berlin talks:

> If there were another world shooting war, the atom and the hydrogen bomb would be used beyond any shadow of doubt. . . . I do not think it is a good idea to take the atom bomb out of the hands of the soldiers (or rather, the airmen). . . . That would be a tremendous advantage to the side with vast masses of docile disciplined expendable manpower; which is no doubt why the Kremlin bangs the drum of atomic disarmament on every occasion.

Marshal Slessor has got a bit mixed in his facts. He has forgotten that the Western powers originally pretended to be all in favour of atomic disarmament, and complained that only Soviet resistance to adequate control and inspection prevented this desirable objective. Now any proposal for atomic disarmament is declared to be a 'Kremlin plot' to disarm the West. However, this only means that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the mask is off and even forgotten. The Western strategists now openly proclaim the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb to be their indispensable supreme weapons and magic talisman; anyone who seeks to banish these jewels of civilisation from conferring their blessings on mankind is an agent of the Kremlin. No doubt they will presently raise germ warfare to the same high pedestal as the supreme 'shield and buckler' of civilisation—as, indeed, the more ardent official military exponents of this strategy in the United States are already trying to do.

Atomic Impasse

The prospect that these Mastodons of the R.A.F. dream of preparing for Britain is sufficiently appalling, and far surpasses anything that Chamberlain's Munich policy prepared for 1940. For unfortunately these prehistoric animals have not yet grown up to the facts of the modern world. In a recent article Professor P. M. S. Blackett has called attention to the significance of the admissions of the former Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission from 1950 to 1953, Gordon Dean, in his newly published 'Report on the Atom'. These admissions coincide with the general trend of current atomic military discussion in the United States on the 'atomic impasse' which has been reached. The entire United States strategy, and correspondingly its arms programme, with the overwhelming priority given to the construction of vast fleets of heavy trans-oceanic strategic bombers capable of delivering the atom bomb across vast distances, have been based on the assumption of an American monopoly of the atom bomb, hydrogen bomb or similar weapons. With the now admitted collapse of this illusion of monopoly, the whole structure of the American and Atlantic strategy is in collapse; and a panic controversy has ensued. The panic character of this controversy is the more marked, because it is admitted that the United States and the Western European countries are relatively more vulnerable; while any attempt at defence is either regarded as impossible or as representing a prohibitive cost. This is what makes so comically inappropriate (comic in the Shakespearean sense of an interlude of clowning light relief against a background of tragedy) the strutting of the antediluvian Montgomerys and Slessors at this moment to proclaim from the housetops the aim of atomic war as the grand invincible Western strategy.

Let him fear this, for it shall come to pass
That every braggart shall be found an ass.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Stockpile for Peace

Gordon Dean admits the prospect that the building of the Soviet stockpile of atom bombs can

> reach sufficient proportions to cancel out the atom as an instrument of warfare. If such an impasse occurs, the United States would appear to be left in a rather unenviable position.

The previous barbaric pipe-dreams of Western strategists of an overwhelming atomic onslaught on the defenceless civilian population of the enemy as the invincible weapon of victory (still lingering in the backwater mentality of British Air Marshals) were based on the assumption of a one-way traffic. Once the prospect is seen in terms of a two-way traffic, with the less favourable conditions for defence on the Western side, the whole picture has changed. New currents have developed in the United States, no longer merely of progressive opinion, but of military opinion, demanding a mutual agreement to abstain from the use of the atom bomb or hydrogen bomb for strategic bombing. Thus the development of the Soviet stockpile of atom bombs and hydrogen bombs is proving a mighty factor for peace and for the aim of banning atomic warfare.

Collapse of Atomic Diplomacy

Dean seeks to find the solution in abandoning the aim of strategic atomic bombing and concentrating instead on the development of tactical atomic weapons for use on the field of battle:

> While we might be unwilling to use our bombs strategically against Russia for fear of retaliation, and Russia might be unwilling to use hers against us for the same reason, we would nevertheless be in a position to use our tactical weapons in the field.

The assumption of advantage through the use of tactical atomic weapons is again based on the fallacious assumption of monopoly; and there is every indication that as many illusions from a military point of view are being built up around tactical atomic weapons as were previously built up around the atom bomb. The bellicose bluster of Dulles is still based on brandishing the threat of a wholesale atomic onslaught on the civilian population; and the weight of the American arms programme is still concentrated on the strategic bomber for offence, with neglect of defence. Blackett suggests that the Dulles line is based on short-term electoral considerations and aims of intimidation rather than serious strategy, and concludes:

> The fundamental dilemma of American atomic policy persists and, moreover, is likely to get more acute with time. . . . Whatever the role of the atom as an instrument of future war, it has already been cancelled out as an instrument of future diplomacy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Atomic Race

The main question, however, involved in the collapse of the old atomic diplomacy is not discussed by Blackett. It lies in the increasing evidence that the Soviet Union has concentrated on the constructive use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, while the United States has concentrated all its resources on the atom bomb, with the most niggardly provision up to the present for constructive development. If now the prospect of the effective use of the atom bomb as the magic weapon of victory or unanswerable instrument of diplomatic intimidation has begun to pass out of the picture, while the Soviet Union has outstripped the United States in the field of peaceful atomic development, then indeed the leaders of the United States and of the West will be proved to have made the most colossal miscalculation of the whole post-war era, and, it might even be said, of the whole history of capitalism. This is the panic fear which is now gripping the hearts of the makers of American policy. It was the fear already expressed by the Chairman of the Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy last summer, when he declared that 'the possibility that Russia might actually demonstrate her allegedly peaceful intentions in the field of atomic energy, while we are still concentrating on atomic weapons, would be a major blow to our position in the world'. It is this fear which has given rise to Eisenhower's initiation of confidential bilateral negotiations with the Soviet Union on the question of an 'international pool' of atomic energy, in the hope that thereby American industry may be able to share in the results of Soviet science.

Economics and Politics

The basic error of the entire Western strategy and diplomacy since the end of the war, typically expressed through their representatives at Berlin, has been its militarist bias. Every question of world politics has been judged primarily in military terms (and Soviet policy has been similarly discussed by these 'experts' in corresponding infantile terms of supposed aims of 'world conquest', 'marching on Western Europe', 'marching on Asia' etc.) at the expense of economic, social and political intelligence. To these strategists and diplomats economic considerations have appeared the mere sordid adjunct and foundation for militarism, only giving rise to alarm when the military megalomania is discovered to be cracking the foundations. They dream of Nazi legions, vast multiplications of divisions, fantastically inflated rearmament pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grammes, proliferation of hundreds of bases over the globe. And then they are startled when they discover that the real problem they have to face is the onset of economic crisis. Basing themselves on the centuries of accumulation of capital in the West, they believe that this represents an overwhelming economic superiority, on which they can draw cheques without limit to pay for their dreams of military domination. They have forgotten that their economic system, despite all its accumulation from the past, is obsolete and rotting, and year by year going down relatively to the new social economic system of socialism.

Portents of the Future

'Our American Economy,' boasted President Eisenhower in his State of the Union Message on January 7, 'is one of the wonders of the world'. Three weeks later, in his Message on the Economic Situation on January 28, he had to admit that the gross national product was falling, industrial production was declining, unemployment was rising, and personal incomes were sinking. During the second half of 1953 industrial production in the United States fell by 6·6 per cent. In the U.S.S.R. industrial production during 1953 rose by 12 per cent.; prices fell; personal real incomes rose; retail sales swept upwards. Reviewing a survey of 'Soviet Economic Growth' by 31 American economic specialists, the *Economist* of February 13 had to admit:

> The exceptionally rapid growth of the national cake throughout the Soviet world . . . might well shock many complacent Western economists sitting on this side of the iron curtain like Chinese mandarins behind their wall.
>
> The claims of Soviet propaganda are normally dismissed with a shrug. But this is a critical, in some cases a very critical, appraisal. . . . Some contributors have even erred on the side of undue caution. . . . Even so, after deflating the exaggerated Soviet claims out of recognition, American experts agreed that Soviet national income is probably rising by about 6½ to 7 per cent. per annum, and that industrial production is expanding even more rapidly. This is an incomparably faster rate than that prevailing in any Western country. It should also be remembered that Soviet growth is uninterrupted by slumps, and that the years chosen to compute this average were not years of 'boom' reconstruction, but normal peace years.

'Staggering Prospect'

Looking ahead on this basis, and noting that on the estimated present pace of advance 'Soviet output in 1970 would be four and a half times as great as in 1950', the *Economist* concludes:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> In the economic race between East and West, the older industrialised states started miles ahead and, thanks to American supremacy, still enjoy a fair advantage. Yet in a handicap race over a long distance the runner with a longer stride is bound to close the gap. . . .
>
> The prospect is staggering.

The conclusions to be drawn from this analysis go considerably further than this journal of financial reaction has yet recognised; for they would knock the bottom out of every customary argument on its other pages. The situation they reveal underlies the proceedings of Berlin. The lords of the sinking economic system, like every dying class before them, desperately seek by violence, by military means, to wreck the new order and to turn back the clock of history. Thereby they only sink deeper in their own contradictions.

The Betrayal of Britain

No country is more profoundly affected by this situation than Britain—once the centre of the world capitalist system, and now the centre of its decay and of all its contradictions. The policy of Mr. Eden at Berlin in subservience to his master Dulles is paid for at the expense of the people of Britain, and even hits Mr. Butler a blow in the face. Mr. Butler at Sydney complained that Britain's rearmament programme was responsible for £350-£400 million on the negative side on the balance of payments (a point worth noting by the T.U.C. General Council, which in its sapient Memorandum on Rearmament in 1952 argued that rearmament had no effect on the balance of payments and represented a safeguard against unemployment). But Mr. Butler drew no practical moral to change Britain's course. The Minister of Defence, Earl Alexander, proclaimed on January 26 that Britain, with ten divisions engaged overseas—an unparalleled number in nominal peacetime—had no mobile strategic reserve left; that one in eleven of the population was engaged in the armed forces or on armaments work; and that 'our military spending per head was larger than any other West European country'. Did he draw any conclusion to aid Britain's desperate economic situation? On the contrary, he called for the maintenance of the two years call-up and an increased effort in order to build up a mobile strategic reserve. Meanwhile the Air Marshals clamour for a public proclamation of the aim of atomic war in order to complete the destruction of Britain.

'Welfare State' or 'Warfare State'

The people of Britain have to pay the price for the policy of Mr. Eden at Berlin, for Mr. Dulles, for Mr. Butler and Lord Alexander.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The five-year review of the insurance system which is now due to take place reveals a terrible picture. Let the full significance of the record set out in the article 'Making the Poor Relieve the Rich' by Katherine Hood in the current number be pondered. It is the counterpart of the *Economist's* picture of 'Soviet Economic Growth'. Two and a half millions, or one in twenty of the population, on the Means Test. Once this would have been called the 'growth of pauperism'. Now it is called the 'Welfare State'. Close on two thirds of the insured persons receiving benefits cannot live on them, even by the grim standards of Assistance Board, and are driven to the Means Test. As Lord Beveridge pointed out in the House of Lords, it is no longer even the 'Subsistence State'. The *Lancet* last year reported a medical review of cases of 'malnutrition' admitted to hospital in Liverpool, and recorded symptoms such as 'occur in most reports of famine'.

> Some seriously ill patients in advanced states of semi-starvation presented a typical appearance identical with that seen among prisoners at the Belsen Camp.

'Famine.' 'Belsen.' This is Britain in 1953—after Mr. Morrison has abolished poverty.

European Peace Plan—Hope for Britain

Never has the fight for a change in foreign policy been so closely linked with the fight for the desperate needs of the people at home. It is against this background that the betrayal of Britain by Mr. Eden at Berlin needs to be seen. When the Soviet Foreign Minister put forward his European Peace Plan, Mr. Eden indignantly replied that this was equivalent to a Monroe Doctrine for Europe—that America should not interfere in Europe. Mr. Eden forgot his history. For the original Monroe Doctrine contained two parts: first, that America should not interfere in Europe, and second, that Europe should not interfere in the American Continent. The second part has been maintained; the first has been thrown to the winds by the successors of Monroe. The Molotov Plan is in effect the fulfilment of the Jeffersonian democratic conception which shaped the Monroe Doctrine. Let Europe—*all* Europe, not half Europe, as the coiners of the hypocritical slogan 'United Europe' really mean when they seek to cover up their policy for the partition of Europe —let *all* Europe unite for peace on a basis of mutual collective security, in a common regional pact, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and end the American intervention which holds Europe divided and under foreign military occupation. Let

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British-French-Soviet co-operation be the cornerstone of such unity of Europe for peace. Such was the inspiring perspective held out at Berlin, which Mr. Eden rejected, but for which the fight must go forward; for there is no other way to the solution of the problems of peace in Europe. Towards these aims let us speed the fight; for they contain also the key to aid us to the solution of Britain's problems.

February 15, 1954. R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom, 12 months, 18s. post free; $3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada ($3.50 if first class mail); elsewhere overseas, 19s. post free.*

LABOUR MONTHLY BY AIRMAIL: *To non-European countries (including Hongkong) except as below, post free: Single copy 4s. 6d.; a year's subscription 54s.*

To China (except Hongkong), Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the Philippines, post free: Single copy 5s.; a year's subscription 60s. To Aden, Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Iraq and Syria, post free, 4s. per copy; a year's subscription 48s.

CONTENTS OF PREVIOUS NUMBERS IN 1954

JANUARY: *Outlook for 1954*, R.P.D.; *The Italian Socialist Party and the Policy of Unity of the Masses*, Pietro Nenni; *A Common Policy for Labour*, Harry Pollitt; *Wages; The Next Step*, J. R. Scott; *The Real Terrorists in Kenya*, Monica Whately; *Bias in Political Economy*, R. L. Meek. BOOK REVIEW: *Ancient History of Western Asia, India and Crete* (Bedrich Hrozny), Robert Browning.

FEBRUARY: *From Cold War to What?* R.P.D.; *France Moves*, Jacques Duclos; *Prospects in Berlin*, Gordon Schaffer; *Wage Movement Lessons*, J. R. Campbell; *Kashmir*, Edward Burton; *I. G. Faben Ueber Alles?* D. N. Pritt, Q.C. BOOK REVIEWS: *Selected Articles and Speeches* (Harry Pollitt); *Works*, Vol. II (J. V. Stalin); *The Game of Death* (A. E. Kahn); *The Water Tower* (Andre Stil); *Wages, Prices and Social Legislation in the Soviet Union* (Lief Bjork); reviewed by R. Stewart, H. B. Lim, M. Davies, D. Michaelson, H.C.C.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TACTICS IN THE WAGE FIGHT

PETER KERRIGAN

ALTHOUGH many important wage claims are still unsettled, it is very much worth while to take a look at the general picture of the wage claims submitted in 1953 and the prospect in 1954. During the early part of the year the records show that at least 27 unions, or groups of unions, decided in favour of wage increases. New claims were submitted (or previous negotiations continued) by, among others, the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, miners, railwaymen, busmen, building workers, seamen, textile, clothing, furniture, gas and agricultural workers, teachers, bakers, electricity supply workers, distributive and postal workers, and civil servants. Claims tabled at the one time involved well over eight million workers.

Up to December 31, 1953, 937,000 workers won increases in weekly wages totalling £2,397,800. This was just over half the amount gained in 1951, as the following tables show:

	Number of workers receiving wage increases	*Total increase in weekly wages at end of year*
1951	12,262,000	£6,569,000
1952	11,484,000	£4,445,700
1953	8,937,000	£2,397,800

The percentage increase in wages was one of the lowest of the post-war period as the following table shows:

1948	... 4 per cent.	1951	... 11 per cent.
1949	... 2 per cent.	1952	... 6 per cent.
1950	... 4 per cent.	1953	... 3 per cent.

It is important to consider the attitude of the employing class in Britain early in 1953 when some of the principal claims were being formulated. Referring to discussions going on among the unions constituting the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions, *The Times* in its editorial of April 29 issued this challenge:

> If these discussions lead now or in the future to a new wages claim . . . they will make it in the almost certain knowledge that they cannot succeed, except at the conclusion of a costly industrial struggle. The comparatively easy annual wage increase of the inflationary post-war period is a thing of the past.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tory government spokesmen echoed this lead in varying ways. Another part of the general strategic line of the capitalist class has been carried out in the way the government has pushed up the cost of living by steadily reducing subsidies and announcing that they will be abolished in 1954, with the certainty of further food price rises. Then came the introduction of the government's great free gift to its staunch supporters the landlords in the shape of the Rent Bill which, if operated, will raise rents of 9,000,000 households.

The employers' tactics in operating the line were soon clear. Nearly three million workers in engineering and shipbuilding received no less than four point-blank refusals of any increase in wages in response to their 15 per cent. claim. The electrical contracting employers disrupted the negotiating machinery in that industry and dug their heels in against any increases. As late as October, 1953, the National Coal Board stated they were not prepared to give anything to the miners. Similarly, in rails, the Railway Executive turned down the rail unions' 15 per cent. claim. Where there were arbitration awards, a number of these resulted in total rejections or in farcical amounts being conceded like 4s. a week or 1d. an hour, which meant less than 4s. a week. All the time there has been a steady spate of propaganda to try to convince the workers—in face of their own experiences, particularly the housewives—that the cost of living has stopped rising. To do this, they utilise the discredited cost of living index, where food increases are counter-balanced by decreases in goods that many workers cannot buy, anyway; this in face of the fact that in two years bread, milk, butter, margarine, cooking fats, cheese (by 1s. a lb.), bacon (by 1s. a lb.), tea (by 1s. 6d. a lb.), coffee (by 1s. 10d. a lb.), flour, sugar and meat have all risen by amounts varying from $1\frac{3}{4}$d. for bread to 1s. 10d. for coffee. Butter and cheese have risen another 4d. and 2d. respectively in February, 1954.

Another line of propaganda has been that in any case no increases are possible unless production rises, and the miners' wage increase has been accompanied by the acceptance of a declaration that further increases can only come from increased efficiency. Actually in 1953 productivity increased by five per cent., against a three per cent. increase in wages. After the drop in productivity in 1952 this increase not only wiped out the setback, but brought it $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. higher than the previous all-time high of 1951. It is to be noted, however, that the right-wing leadership of the T.U.C. and the Labour Party, while campaigning

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for increased production, are also striving to convince the workers that they must not fight for increased wages even when production goes up. Thus at the T.U.C. the right wing—in the main the bloc votes of the Transport Workers, Municipal Workers and Miners—defeated the E.T.U. resolution for a vigorous campaign in support of higher wages. In the amended version of the Labour Party Programme, *Challenge to Britain*, issued after the Margate Conference, they ask:

> What incentives shall we use in calling on the British People to postpone an improvement in their living standards and to watch while the fruits of their hard work are used not to increase the supply of goods in the shops but for building new furnaces and factories?

That question, coupled with their actions and the fact that greater dividends than ever are being declared makes clear their line.

However, the workers have other ideas than those of the employers, the Tories or the right-wing leaders. These ideas the workers have increasingly put into practice, and two sectors have undoubtedly given the most effective fighting lead. One of the most interesting types of action, and certainly one that has many lessons for the whole of the working class, has been carried through by the 30,000 or so members of the E.T.U. engaged in electrical contracting. On September 1, 1953, in support of their claim for a substantial increase, they resumed strike action on selected contracts, and by early September 4,000 of their members were involved. The Ministry of Labour set up a Court of Inquiry in September, and the dispute was called off pending its outcome. The Court recommended (1) further negotiation on the wage claim, and (2) that arbitration should be considered. Further negotiations eventually took place, but the employers' final offer of 1½d. an hour increase, not to be applied to certain areas in the south of England, and accompanied with the proposal that overtime payments be cut, set off the next series of actions.

This time these 'guerrilla' strikes, as they were called, took the form of stoppages of indefinite duration on a number of selected jobs, accompanied by a series of partial actions. The largest of these was the one-day stoppage on January 18 of all twenty odd thousand adult E.T.U. members in contracting. This was followed by one week's stoppage of all 7,000 London members. When they went back, 1,500 came out in Liverpool for a week. Then, after them, over 1,000 in Manchester. At the time of writing, the dispute is still going on with a 7,000 stoppage—and with nearly 10,000 in a torchlight procession through London. It has evoked tremendous

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

solidarity from the rank and file behind their leadership, and met with widespread sympathy from the rest of the working class as well as among the public, despite the vindictive and utterly unscrupulous press campaign of most of the national press. This is in marked contrast to the magnificent support given by the *Daily Worker* to the men's case, exposing the arguments of the capitalist press. Similar support has been given each week in *Reynolds News*, the organ of the Co-operative movement, and both papers have been publicly thanked by Walter Stevens on behalf of the Union. Whatever the final outcome, these actions have had positive effects extending far beyond the electricians. Both the capitalist class and the workers have shown their full appreciation of this fact.

Easily the greatest movement in terms of those engaged, and certainly the biggest in Britain since the General Strike of 1926 has developed around the engineers' and shipbuilders' claim for 15 per cent. increase. In the middle of the year, the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions launched a nation-wide campaign to explain their case and win support. Millions of leaflets were issued by the A.E.U., the most powerful union in the Confederation and by the Confederation itself. These included special leaflets appealing to women workers. Accompanying the official meetings and demonstrations the rank and file developed great initiative. The shop stewards' organisations in many factories set up, together with the workers, Action Committees. These shop stewards and Action Committees in many cases in conjunction with the Union and Confederation District Committees developed widespread token stoppages. The greatest of these was the stoppage for half a day of 250,000 workers on Clydeside, but 40,000 stopped in Belfast, approximately 100,000 in the London area, 30,000 in Sheffield, and so on. These naturally led up to bigger things and the Confederation unions called a one-day token stoppage for December 2. This marked the highest point of the movement so far. The response was magnificent and in the decisive Shipbuilding and Engineering centres 100 per cent. complete among the skilled workers, with the unskilled and women not far behind. Many thousands of non-unionists stopped as well. Great initiative was shown by rank-and-file pickets including many women, and a new generation of workers (without any previous experience of this kind) moved into action and demonstrated its basic soundness.

There is no doubt that December 2 was a decisive factor in influencing the decision of the two principal railway trade unions to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reject the Railway Staff National Tribunal award of 4s. per week flat increase and then to decide on a national strike to commence from midnight on December 20, 1953. At the same time there had been token stoppages developing among the busmen in the provinces and a fairly widespread work-to-rule and ban on overtime movement in London. The oil workers in the London area had staged a ten-day strike against redundancy and for 10s. per week increase. Building workers in Lancashire and London were very active.

In this situation the government had to decide whether to stick to the Arbitration awards, face a strike on the railways on the eve of Christmas with the possibility of other sectors of nationalised and private industries getting out of hand rapidly, and the very future of the government at stake, or to try and stave off the showdown by concessions. They made concessions. The rail strike was averted by an agreement to give the railwaymen from 7s. to the lowest paid to 10s. for the highest paid, the equivalent of six per cent. advance, compared with $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. to $3\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. representing the 4s. award. The London busmen were conceded 7s., and in January, 1954, the miners were given 7s. 6d. per week for surface workers and 8s. 6d. for underground workers against the 12s. 6d. and 13s. 6d. per week demanded for 410,000 day-wage men. Teachers under the Burnham Committee award are to get salary increases of from £35 to £55 per year for men and £35 to £44 for women, commencing at Easter, 1954. The salaries are to be fixed for three years; but then the Minister of Education, Miss Horsbrugh, has announced the increase of one per cent. (from five to six per cent.) in the deductions from salaries to pay for superannuation. This means if permitted a cut of over £4 per year in the basic salary of women and £4 10s. in the basic salary of men. In the so-called private sector of industry there have been no concessions at all, at least not in the decisive sectors. The engineering and shipbuilding unions' Executives decided before Christmas to operate a ban on overtime and piecework as from January 18.

Using a well-tried manoeuvre and with the full assistance of the right-wing leaders the Minister of Labour set up a Court of Inquiry and by a narrow majority the Executive of the Confederation of Shipbuilding and Engineering Unions decided to delay application of the ban pending the outcome of the Court, which has dragged out for some weeks already. The decisive body in initiating the fight for the 15 per cent. claim was the National Committee of the A.E.U., a rank-and-file body of 52 delegates from the workshops. It

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would appear that it was the right-wing majority of full-time E.C. officials of the A.E.U. that tipped the scale against Joe Scott's motion at the Confederation meeting to go ahead with the ban irrespective of the setting up of the Court of Inquiry.

In electrical contracting the recalcitrant employers were encouraged to stiffen their resistance to the E.T.U. wage demands by the open support of Sir Percy Mills, Chairman of the Engineering Employers, who was one of the Tribunal that made the insulting award of 'three cups of tea' a day to the railwaymen. In building, the employers had to grant 1d. per hour increase under the cost of living agreement, but so far have made no concessions to the builders' demand for 9d. per hour. In clothing, the employers have answered the clothing workers' demand for 6d. per hour advance in earnings by a final offer of 2½d. for men and 2d. for women on only the minimum rates. This would mean no advance at all for the overwhelming bulk of clothing workers and has raised a storm of protest. Other sections with claims in or pending include 90,000 busworkers, whose claim for 7s., the same as London, has been rejected by private companies, while 60,000 busworkers employed by municipalities outside London have been awarded only 4s. per week, and want a minimum of 7s. Highly secret negotiations for an increase of 12s. 6d. per week for steel workers are going on while the craftsmen's demand for a substantial increase in the same industry has been refused. The equal pay campaign of women workers, headed by the Civil Service unions and the teachers, is growing in strength despite the government's stone-walling tactics.

Another matter of outstanding importance is the inordinate length of time between the tabling of claims and the settlement. In the first half of 1953 weekly wage rates only rose by one per cent. and this included claims coming over from 1952. In the second half weekly wage rates only went up by two per cent. Remember railwaymen, busmen, miners and others who did finally get a rise only got them in December and January. Three million engineers, 1¼ million builders, and hundreds of thousands of clothing workers, transport workers, steel workers and others are still waiting. It is crystal clear that wage increases conceded so far were only given under pressure of strikes or threats of strikes. It is equally clear, especially in engineering and other sectors, that only if the previous high level of action is reached and intensified are they going to get the 15 per cent. and similar claims.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There needs to be a full appreciation that the claims already settled have been fixed at too low a figure. Consequently the next round of wage claims will need to be tabled soon and take into account both the meagreness of the settlement and the delay. The workers of Britain following their experiences in 1953 will not tolerate the same protracted negotiations and leisurely conduct of courts of inquiry and arbitration. The claims are just and require a speedy termination of negotiations. There is a growing awareness of this fact and increasing appreciation that the fight for wages is bound up with a fight against the government's whole policy. That is why there is such a big support for immediate increase in West-East trade, and for a settlement, even if only a partial one, in the negotiations going on in Berlin as this is being written.

Many workers who took little interest in their trade unions or in what are called politics, are discussing and expressing concern about what will happen to us if the American depression grows deeper. Many thousands of non-unionists who experienced December 2 have become trade unionists. In many factories the workers are strengthening their job organisation and reviving the Action Committees. There are thousands of miners in every coalfield in this country today who reject the arguments of the Lawthers, Watsons and Joneses, and understand clearly that their present wage advances could not have been got but for the fight of electricians, engineers, railwaymen, busmen, builders and others. The decisive thing today is for more and more workers to be got to understand the overall strategy of the capitalist class, the Tory government and right-wing leaders of the trade union movement and Labour Party. Then they will realise the importance of their own strategic aims and the tactics of unity in action, learning from every new experience and strengthening the ties of international trade union unity that were never so necessary as today. The Wankie miners' strike in Central Africa, the latest wage cut of the Malayan workers, are creating a response in the British trade union movement, because more and more workers are coming to see them as part of the same battle as the electricians, the engineers, the builders, the clothing workers, the Lancashire cotton operatives, the agricultural workers and the so-called white-collar workers.

Unity will defeat the capitalists—unity of trade unionists, tenants, old folk, youth and women; unity that responds to every call from whatever section of our wide-flung battle front, because we are learning anew the old trade union adage, *An injury to one is an injury to all. United we stand! Divided we fall!*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRYING TO SAVE EUROPE

QUÆSTOR

THE Berlin Conference of Foreign Ministers which opened on January 25 and closed on February 18 was the outcome of a series of diplomatic exchanges, beginning with a Soviet Note on March 10, 1952, which proposed precisely such a conference. The aim of the meeting, said the Note, should be to agree on a peace treaty with Germany, based on the principles of (i) unification of Germany with guarantees for democracy (ii) German armed forces for defensive purposes only (iii) withdrawal of foreign forces (iv) Germany not to enter any coalition directed against any of her former enemies (v) acceptance of the German frontiers as defined at Potsdam in 1945 by the Great Powers.

For nearly two years the United States and British Governments refused to come to such a conference, insisting that only German unity should be the subject of discussion. The reason for this was clear—that the other Soviet proposals interfered with their plans for Germany. What were those plans? On September 18, 1950 (when Attlee was still Prime Minister and Bevin, Foreign Secretary) a conference of the American, British and French Foreign Ministers agreed in New York on 'West German participation in an integrated force for the defence of European freedom', *i.e.*, on rebuilding a West German army. Dulles in his reply to the Soviet Note declared (March 27, 1952) that the United States would not be 'deflected' from this aim. And on May 26, 1952 the three Western Powers, brushing aside the Soviet offer, signed a military alliance with Western Germany at Bonn, providing for (i) 12 German divisions of 13,000 men each (ii) their possible uniting in army corps (iii) West German Nazi-trained officers to organise these forces, and to have 36 per cent. of the posts in the future 'European Army' (iv) German unity, on condition (clause 3) that the united country were 'integrated within the European Community'.

What was to be the aim of this German army, as Adenauer and his Ministers understood it? They made no secret of their purpose. On March 16, 1952, Adenauer proclaimed that his government wanted 'the establishment of a new order in Eastern Europe'—particularly the revision of the Oder-Neisse frontier and the 'clarification' (an old Hitlerite term) of relations with Poland and Czechoslovakia. 'The time is past when the Oder-Neisse line could be

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forced on a defeated nation' trumpeted his Official Bulletin (March 23, 1952). It is necessary 'to integrate the whole of Europe up to the Urals', declared—in familiar Hitler language—the West German State Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Hallstein, two days later, lecturing to an admiring audience at Washington. This kind of language, promising a new war of revenge eastward, into which revived and rearmed German militarism would obligingly drag its American and British patrons in Syngman Rhee style (while they covered their eyes, peeping through the fingers, at the preliminaries), has gone on ever since. As recently as September 7, 1953, Adenauer announced 'The time has come to speak, not of the reunification of Germany, but of the liberation of the Eastern Zone'.

Rarely in modern international history, in fact, has there been any parallel to the clearly anti-Soviet purpose for which the American and British Governments have been proceeding with the rearmament of Western Germany—a territory which they began making safe for Big Business and landlordism even before the end of the war. So obvious was this, indeed, that on August 1, 1952, the entire Parliamentary Labour Party voted (253-293) against the ratification of the Bonn Treaty signed nine weeks before; and the Margate Conference of the Labour Party in 1953 expressly repudiated 'any policy of forcible liberation of Eastern Europe', expressed 'its concern at the resurgence of German reactionary nationalism' and, while pressing for free elections in Germany, demanded effective guarantees both for Germany's territorial integrity and independence and 'against any forcible attempt by Germany at territorial revision'.

This is the background of the Berlin Conference, essential for understanding its two outstanding features—the determination of the Soviet Union to offer every possible suggestion for uniting Germany and guaranteeing European peace which *excluded* the re-creation of a militarist Germany: and the determination of the U.S.A., and of the British and the French Governments under its dictation, to say 'No' to every proposal by Molotov which did not *include* the remilitarisation of all Germany under their control.

What were the proposals made by Molotov? It will be simplest to summarise them in calendar form.

1. A Five-Power Conference (Britain, China, France, U.S.A., U.S.S.R.) in May and June this year 'to consider urgent measures relating to the easing of tension in international relations' (January 26).
2. The four Powers present to take steps within the framework of the United Nations to convene in 1954 'a world conference on a general

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reduction of armaments', both members and non-members of the United Nations participating: the reduction to be 'linked with the simultaneous settlement of the question of atomic weapons' (January 28).

3. Representatives of both parts of Germany to be invited to take part in the discussions of the German question (January 29).

4. The deputy Foreign Ministers of the Four Powers to draw up a draft peace treaty with Germany within three months—other Allies whose armed forces took part in the war with Germany stating their views, and the two existing governments in Germany taking part 'pending the formation of a provisional German Government': the peace conference to be held not later than October (February 1).

5. The peace treaty with Germany to be based on the following principles: (i) Germany to be united, with guarantees for democracy; (ii) all foreign armies and bases to be withdrawn within one year; (iii) Germany 'not to enter into any coalitions or military alliances directed against any country whose armed forces took part in the war against Germany', and not to be bound by agreements previously signed by either West or East Germany; (iv) German frontiers to be as fixed at Potsdam; (v) no economic or trade restrictions on peaceful German development, and no liability for post-war debts except trade debts; (vi) German armed forces and war industry to be limited to her requirements for national defence; (vii) Germany to be admitted to U.N.O. (February 1).

6. A referendum of the whole of Germany for or against the Bonn Treaty or the Peace Treaty (February 3).

7. An all-German democratic electoral law to be drafted by an all-German provisional government, to be formed by agreement between representatives of Eastern and Western Germany: the provisional Government also to have the task of preventing Germany being involved in any aggressive coalition, and of ensuring freedom for democratic organisations (February 4).

8. Germany to be freed, as from January 1 of this year, from reparations payment, post-war debts (other than trade), all occupation expenditures unpaid since 1945, and all future occupation expenses above 5 per cent. of the budgetary revenues of the two German governments (February 6).

9. Pending the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and its unification along democratic and peaceful lines (i) occupation forces to be withdrawn from both parts of Germany, except for agreed limited contingents; (ii) police units for internal order and frontier defence to be formed in both parts, their size to be agreed between the four Powers, who would form mixed inspection groups to supervise the carrying out of the agreement in both parts of Germany; (iii) the four Powers to take the initiative in calling a conference of European States to adopt 'a collective security treaty which will provide appropriate guarantees against aggression and the violation of peace in Europe' (February 10).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

March 18th, 1871 - The Paris Commune

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drawings from the pamphlet 'THE PARIS COMMUNE— a story in pictures' *by* WILLIAM SIEGEL, *published in U.S.A.* 1931.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

10. The Collective Security Treaty to be based on the following principles: (i) it should be open to all European States, 'without regard to their social systems', including both parts of Germany pending their unification; (ii) all signatories to settle disputes arising among them by peaceful means; (iii) an armed attack in Europe against any signatory to be considered an attack against all the others, who will go to its aid by all means at their disposal; (iv) full information to be sent to the Security Council of the United Nations on all arrangements made under the Treaty; (v) periodic conferences of signatories to be held, and permanent consultative political and military committees to be set up; (vi) the U.S.A. and the People's Republic of China to have observers on these committees; (vii) signatories not to conclude any agreements contrary to the purposes of the Treaty, but their existing obligations, 'the principles and purposes of which are in line with the principles and purposes of the present Treaty', to remain valid; (viii) the Treaty to last for 50 years (February 10).

11. The setting up of two all-German Committees, one for economic, and the other for cultural relations to be 'recommended to the appropriate bodies in Eastern and Western Germany'; and a Four-Power agreement on the two German police forces (February 17).

This remarkable series of proposals, with their readiness to meet a series of objections raised to each in turn (apart from whether these objections were well founded or not), is not only in the grand tradition of Soviet diplomacy—which has always put practical suggestions for peaceful coexistence with capitalist countries above questions of doctrine—but reflects demands made again and again by trade unions and local Labour Parties, Socialist and peace bodies, women's and co-operative organisations, in this and many other countries. World agreement for disarmament for preference—but at all events withdrawal of foreign forces from the heart of Europe as soon as possible: a provisional German government if possible—but at any rate both parts of Germany to have their say in deciding their fate: a German peace treaty by agreement within the next few months for preference—but at least give the German people a chance to vote on whether they want the Bonn Treaty which the Labour Party refused to ratify: world agreement between the Five Great Powers on how to reduce international tension, for preference —but if you won't have it, then at least a European Security Treaty which will give a chance to breathe freely to 32 sorely-tried States.

Particularly revealing, too, have been the arguments with which the American Government and its two satellites have sought to justify their consistent 'No, no, no' to these proposals.

1. Dulles opposed a Five Power Conference because allegedly they would be trying 'to rule the world'—as though that did not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

apply equally to the Four Power Conference at Berlin, and the innumerable Anglo-Franco-American conferences at Bermuda and elsewhere. He also denounced People's China as an 'aggressor' who must not be 'taken to one's breast and called good'—as though China had not far more right to say the same of American intervention in Chinese internal affairs, long before she provoked the Korean war in 1950.

2. The disarmament proposal was opposed by Bidault on the well-known American argument that these matters ought to be discussed in the United Nations—where there is a permanent American-controlled majority; as though Britain, France and U.S.A. have never discusssed action on this matter among themselves.

3. An invitation to both German governments to state their views was rejected without any argument, beyond the one that Adenauer would not agree—as though his Government would seriously resist any pressure from the Americans.

4. The proposals with regard to a peace treaty with Germany were rejected by Dulles and his satellites, first for the 'reason' just stated, secondly because it was necessary to set up a German government first by 'free elections'—under foreign occupation—and thirdly because in any case they insisted on Germany being armed 'in association with other States whose pacific intentions no one could doubt' (Bidault on February 2)—as though America's 'pacific intentions' are not doubted by hundreds of millions of people throughout the world.

5. The proposal of a referendum was rejected because there was 'nothing incompatible' between the Bonn Treaty and a peace treaty with Germany—as though any peace treaty were really possible if the rearming of Germany on the lines laid down at Bonn took place.

6. The proposal for all-German elections to be organised by the Germans themselves, without interference by the presence of foreign armies, was rejected on the ground that this would 'imply the end of any defence of Western Germany and its exposure to the vast forces that lay to the east of it' (Dulles). On this well-worn bogey of the 'menacing Soviet armies poised to strike', it is sufficient to recall that (i) it was an American general (Clay) and an American Secretary for War (Forrestal) who pressed in 1948 for a military drive into East Germany (ii) it was an American general (MacArthur) who drove the foreign armies in Korea up to the Chinese border, and bombed Chinese cities from the air, in 1950. No Soviet menace of this kind has ever taken place.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

7. The proposals for even the limited withdrawal of foreign troops were further rejected because this would mean 'disorganisation of the defences of the Western Allies' (Bidault)—naturally, neither he nor Dulles would object to the disorganisation of the defences of Poland, Czechoslovakia or the U.S.S.R.!

8. And the European Security Treaty was rejected on the ground that it meant giving up N.A.T.O., the American-controlled bloc which is supposed to 'guarantee' Europe, as well as the E.D.C. In reality, in so far as obligations under N.A.T.O. 'are in line with the principles and purposes' of the European Security Treaty (and the Western Ministers insisted that it was for defensive purposes only), it would not have to be given up—*provided German rearmament is not an essential part of it*. Molotov underlined that the danger lies in E.D.C. and that N.A.T.O. might be studied to see if it could be compatible with the Security Treaty. Similarly Eden argued that the U.S.S.R. would be allowed to 'keep its alliances'—carefully obscuring the plain fact that all Soviet treaties for mutual defence with its neighbours lay down explicitly that they apply only to cases of aggression by Germany or countries allied with her. But then, as the debates in Berlin have revealed, *putting Western Germany in a position where she can carry out such aggression is an essential part of strategy for the U.S.A. and its satellite governments.* Of course, it was argued that the 'European Defence Community' would be a check on Adenauer's new armoured legions: a likely story, once they were the strongest single miltary force in Western Europe—and assuming that the U.S.A. wished to restrain them in their 'liberating' mission *to the East*.

But history teaches that a 'one-way gun' for German militarism, going off eastward but never westward, is an impossibility. Dulles, Eden and Bidault at Berlin, behind all the flapdoodle about free German elections (as though Hitler didn't come to power in just such elections, financed by the same big German-American trusts that now run Western Germany), are trying to create that one-way gun. It is a deadly menace to Britain, first and foremost, whatever American purposes it may suit. It is in the interests of the British people to declare this, loudly, unmistakably and decisively—and to demand the acceptance of the plan for European Security as a new chance of peace for the world.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW THE POOR RELIEVE THE RICH

KATHERINE HOOD

'In my department, sir, a thief is a person who lives longer than the statutory expectation of life entitles him to, and goes on drawing public money when, if he were an honest man, he would be dead. . . .'

'Do your accounts show a deficiency or a surplus?'

'A surplus. That's what I can't make out. That's the artfulness of these people.'

(George Bernard Shaw, *Back to Methuselah.*)

SOME time this year, the Minister of National Insurance will begin reviewing the level of retirement pensions, sickness and unemployment benefits and other insurance payments at present in force under the National Insurance Act of 1946. The Review is provided for in the Act; it has to take place every five years, and in carrying it through the Minister has to have regard to the circumstances of insured persons and in particular 'the expenditure which is necessary for the preservation of health and working capacity'.

Mr. Osbert Peake, the Minister who will be undertaking the Review, is an ex-coalowner whose daughter is Lady-in-Waiting to Princess Margaret; he once attacked Sir William Beveridge on whose Report the Act was based on the grounds that he had 'raised hopes which could not be fulfilled; no system of weekly payments can abolish want in a free society; so long as men are free to spend their money as they please there will be homes in which want exists'.* (A polite version of the old theory that the workers are poor because they waste their money on drink.) Before coming to any decision, Mr. Peake will presumably consult with two leading colleagues. One is the Minister of Health, Mr. Iain Macleod, who once wrote: 'The question therefore which poses itself is not "Should a means test be applied to a social service?" but "Why should any social service be provided *without* a test of need?" '† The other is Sir Geoffrey Hutchinson, the new chairman of the National Assistance Board, who thinks that 'we ought to be proud of our rich men, not ashamed of them'.‡

Daily Herald, June 22, 1943.

†*Social Services ; Needs and Means*, by Iain Macleod & J. Enoch Powell, 1950.

‡*Commonsense about Surtax*, 1929

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is to this supremely reactionary trio that the Tories have entrusted the fate of the old, the sick, the blind, the disabled, the unemployed, the widows, the orphans—all the people who through no fault of their own are temporarily or permanently deprived of earning capacity, or incapable of self-support.

We do not yet know what the Tories are proposing to do about the National Insurance benefits. But the ground has been well prepared for months past with ponderous articles in *The Times* and elsewhere. The argument goes rather like this: The proportion of old people in the population is growing, and people are living longer, so that, whereas there are now six persons of working age for every one over 65, in 25 years' time the ratio will be only four to one. As the number of old people increases the payments out of the Fund on Retirement Pension will increase so that after 1954-55 the National Insurance Fund will begin to show a 'deficit' which will reach the terrifying figure of more than £400 million annually by 1977-78. Therefore it is urgent that the retirement age be raised from 65 to, say, 67 or 68. And although existing benefits are below subsistence level, these cannot be increased without an increase in weekly contributions from insured persons.

Before discussing the fallacies in these assumptions and the clear intentions which lie behind them, it is important to recall what was the declared purpose of the National Insurance Act. The 1946 Act was the culmination of more than a century's struggle against the Poor Law. During the twenties and thirties, this struggle had before it one over-riding aim; that all those who because of age, sickness, enforced unemployment or for other reason were deprived of earning capacity should be entitled *as of right* and without Means Test to an income sufficient for maintenance. In 1942 this aim found reflection in Sir William Beveridge's Report whose central theme was precisely this—a flat rate of benefit 'intended in itself to be sufficient without further resources to provide the minimum income needed for subsistence in all normal cases'. Thus, though far from progressive in certain directions, the Beveridge Report did embody a *principle* which the ruling class were forced to make some show of accepting. The recognition of this principle was a major victory for the working class—but there the victory ended. For when in 1946 the Labour Government introduced the National Insurance Act they quite deliberately made use of the old, pre-war, discredited working-class cost of living index to fix the benefits below even the low Beveridge 'subsistence' level. This was in practice officially admitted to be the case; the old age pensioners who received the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new Retirement Pensions in 1946 were *even at that time* entitled to go to the Assistance Board for supplementary payments which were additional to the pension. By July, 1948, when the Act came fully into operation, prices had risen substantially and the value of the benefits had fallen even further; subsequent increases in benefits failed to keep pace with the further cost of living rise so that the present basic pension of 32s. 6d. for a single person or 54s. for a married couple is now little more than a token payment.

What is the result? No less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ million people (or one person in 20) are now living in great wretchedness on weekly payments from the National Assistance Board *after* the application of a Means Test. More than half of them are fully insured and are receiving these Assistance Board payments to supplement their insurance benefits and so bring them *up* to the Assistance Board's semi-starvation level of 35s. plus rent for a single person or 59s. plus rent for a married couple. Such is the reality behind Mr. Herbert Morrison's boast to the 1948 Labour Party Conference that 'we have swept away the Charity and the Poor Law State and substituted the Social Security State'. The totally inadequate level to which insurance benefits have sunk is in fact admitted on all sides. But proposals for increasing them are always met with the reply that this would involve an increase in insured person's contributions. What is the real issue here?

When the ruling class are forced to make concessions in the form of improved social services they always aim so far as they can to make the working class pay for them themselves. The well-to-do make a substantial contribution towards any service paid for out of Government taxation because income tax is based on ability to pay. The straight weekly insurance contribution of (for example) 5s. 9d. for an adult man and 4s. 6d. for an adult woman is taken from all insured persons including the lowest paid wage earner—the man or woman who earns so little that they are below income tax level. A contributory scheme therefore always enables the ruling class to shift a substantial proportion of the burden on to the lowest paid. The ruling class could hardly have carried this through so successfully in the case of the National Insurance Act had the Labour leadership not so readily espoused the contributory idea, presenting it as the only alternative to a Means Test and loudly proclaiming that the workers didn't want 'something for nothing'. Thus Mr. James Griffiths told the Labour Party Conference in 1946 that a contributory scheme was 'the one most in keeping with the character of our people and most in keeping with our tradition'.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This was only the beginning of a most remarkable swindle. The finances of the Act are handled through a separate National Insurance Fund. The original scheme was drawn up so that in its early years two-thirds of the Fund's income would come from employers and insured persons via insurance stamps, rather over a quarter from Exchequer Grants, and the rest from miscellaneous income. It was expected that income would just about balance the expenditure on benefits for the first few years, but it was also decided that in future years, as expenditure on benefits rose resulting from the ageing population, the Government's contribution would get heavier. In practice, events entirely confounded the actuarial calculations which formed the basis of the scheme. The main, though not the only, reason for this was that it had been drawn up in the belief that unemployment during 1948-53 would average $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.—more than four times the actual rate. The saving in unemployment benefit and other consequential increases in income resulted in enormous surpluses of £137 million in 1949-50 and £144 million in 1950-51. In vain did the old age pensioners and others demand that these surpluses be used to increase pensions. In 1951 the Labour Government cut the Exchequer Contribution down on the grounds that the continuation of these surpluses was 'undesirable'. In 1952 the Tories increased benefits but raised the *insured persons contributions* in order to pay for them. So that whereas in 1950-51 the Government was contributing 26 per cent. of the Fund's income, by 1953-54 it was contributing only 12 per cent.* In other words the burden has been shifted off the Exchequer and on to the insured person. Meanwhile the Fund, which started its existence endowed with nearly £900 million derived from the previous unemployment and sickness schemes has now at its disposal the colossal sum of £1,357 million.

It is in the light of these figures that talk about the Fund 'running at a deficit' from 1954 onwards must be viewed. The word 'deficit' has about it the smell of something slightly 'unsound'—rather like 'living on an overdraft'. But in fact this so-called 'deficit' would have been postponed for several further years if the Government had merely fulfilled its original contract. 'Ah yes', it is argued, 'we see that there is plenty of money in the Fund *now* for an increase in benefits all round—we see also that there would have been plenty for several years to come had the Government contributed its agreed proportion into it. But is it not true that the population is growing

*The actual figures are 1950-51, £360 million from Insurance Stamps, £139 million from the Government ; 1953-54, £444 million from Insurance Stamps, £71 million from the Government.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

older so that in 25 years their cost to the nation will be fantastically heavy? And if we increase benefits now will we not be committing future generations to an intolerable burden?'

Let us examine the figures. According to the Government Actuary the share contributed by the Government into the Fund annually on its present basis will rise from £170 million in 1957 to £485 million in 1977. Even if he was right, this £485 million, be it noted, is about one quarter of what is spent on armaments which now run the Government annually into a 'deficit' of £1,700 million —an intolerable burden indeed. But we know one thing for certain about the Government Actuary—the figures he drew up in 1946 to cover the first five years of the scheme on the assumption of 8½ per cent. unemployment were proved so disastrously incorrect in practice that the whole finances of the scheme were subsequently entirely revised. It is indeed remarkable that a man who failed so signally to prophesy correctly for two or three years ahead should be so implicitly believed in his forecasts for a quarter of a century hence. For quite apart from changes in the value of money and productivity which are bound to make nonsense of his calculations, a change in the birthrate in the next few years, or in the proportion of housewives going out to work would knock his figures sideways. Moreover his present figures are based, according to Government instructions, on the assumption that there will be an *average* of four per cent. unemployment for the next 20 years—more than double the present rate. So that acceptance by the Labour movement of these calculations is tantamount to accepting a permanent prospect of recessions, slumps, and huge arms expenditure—indeed accepting capitalism without end.

Is it not time the Movement ceased to be hypnotised by the cooked-up figures of a reactionary Government, backed by the dubious forecasts of 'experts' who are always proved wrong? For the reason for the figures is clear. It is not tenderness for future generations. It is to obtain acceptance *now* of measures which will require the old to work till they drop, and force ever more millions on to a Means Test. The overwhelming need of the moment is for the Labour Movement to rally in support of benefits which are adequate now without Means Test, and without increase in workers' contributions. For this indeed we would be earning the gratitude of generations to come.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TOWARDS AN ECONOMIC CRISIS IN THE U.S.A.

EUGENE VARGA

(from *Pravda,* January 28, 1954.)

AT the beginning of January, President Eisenhower presented his first message to Congress on the state of the Union. However hard his economic advisers tried to embellish the situation, it looked far worse than a year ago. The facts testify that the promises that Eisenhower made before the elections have remained unfulfilled. He promised prosperity, but his ministers could not prevent the beginning of a crisis of overproduction; they have only secured huge profits for the big monopolies.

'There is no Crisis'

The 'scientific' economists of the U.S.A., the big capitalists and the right-wing trade union leaders can no longer deny the facts of a fall in production, a rise in unemployment, a fall in prices, etc. However, afraid of revealing the very deep contradictions of the capitalist mode of production, they avoid the word 'crisis' in every way possible, and use instead a host of more agreeable expressions: 'a slowing up of tempos of growth', 'normal adjustment to a new situation', 'lull', 're-adjustment', 'falling tendency', etc. 'There is no crisis', American economists declare. Use of the words 'depression' and 'crisis' is considered dangerous.

Marx gave the only true, the only scientific theory of economic crises. He showed the inevitability of the periodic recurrence of crises of overproduction under capitalism. During the last hundred years there have been no less than ten world crises alone which have gripped the main or all capitalist countries. Nonetheless bourgeois economists try to picture the crisis of overproduction as occurring not from objective causes, but from every kind of subjective reason. It turns out, for example, that talk of 'crisis' shakes confidence and brings on a crisis! Fairless, president of the steel trust, United States Steel Corporation, announced this at the Economic Club in Detroit: 'We ourselves can bring on a crisis by our talk about crises'. Capitalists and their economists—consciously or unconsciously—confuse cause and effect.

It stands to reason that after the beginning of a crisis, arising as a consequence of objective causes, people adjust their behaviour in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the economic field to the new situation and thus deepen the crisis. But this is not 'subjective' action, it is also objective necessity. Each capitalist, anticipating a fall in prices, tries to buy less in order to protect his profits, to clear old stocks more quickly, and to put off the replacement of his fixed capital. Such activity brings about an acceleration of the fall in production and prices. Workers and employees, seeing the increasing frequency of mass dismissals, fear the future for quite objective reasons. They reduce all their purchases, as far as possible, especially of durable consumer goods: furniture, clothing, footwear, radios, etc., in order to have at least some resources for the period of impending unemployment. Their actions reduce the size of the home market, increase overproduction and deepen the crisis. Farmers, suffering heavily from the fall in prices, reduce purchases of agricultural machinery, fertilisers, and consumer goods. This deepens the crisis. But all this happens, not as a result of 'talk of crisis', not from subjective causes but because of the *existence* of a crisis of overproduction.

Fall in Production in the U.S.A.

An increase in production in the U.S.A. continued for a fairly long time after overproduction had already set in. In their scramble for maximum profit the capitalists increased production even more, produced for stock-piling, sold goods on credit, at the expense of the future consumer power of the population, hoping that the difficulties of realisation would be transient. It has been just the same in the past before every economic crisis. Huge stocks of goods have been created in the U.S.A. In September, 1953, stocks of private entrepreneurs in industry, wholesale and retail trade, amounted to $80,000 millions. Stocks of farm produce held by the state, and stocks in farmers' barns, on security of which they had received state credit, are valued at $6,000 millions. The value of state stocks of strategic raw materials has reached $5-$6,000 millions. The value of the huge stockpile of arms and munitions of all types (atom bombs, tanks, guns, etc.) amounts to not less than $100,000 millions. The total of consumer credit amounted to $28,200 millions in October, 1953, according to official data. Stocks continued to increase until November, 1953; and the total of consumer credit continues to increase at the present time.

But neither production for stockpiling, nor sales on account of the future purchasing power of society can ward off the crisis of overproduction. The following facts are evidence of this:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Index of Physical Volume of U.S. Industrial Production
(1934-5=100)

December, 1952	235
March, 1953 (maximum)	243
September, 1953	234
November, 1953	228
December, 1953 (our estimate)	226

Thus the fall in production amounts to seven per cent., even according to official figures.

Marx and Lenin taught that deterioration of the position of the working masses and their low purchasing power inevitably puts a periodic limit to the striving of the capitalists to extend production without limit; the proletarian condition of the masses makes overproduction inevitable.

Analysing American official statistics, we find concrete confirmation of this proposition of Marxism-Leninism. In those branches of industry which are chiefly engaged in satisfying the demand of the working people, the fall in production began several months earlier than the general fall in production. Thus, production of cotton textiles and knitwear had already begun to contract at the beginning of 1953. Production of footwear had already contracted 20 per cent. between March and July.

The influence of the different rates of development of purchasing power of various strata of the population is particularly evident in the U.S. motor car market. A year ago a surplus of second-hand motor cars, which are bought by working people, was already being felt. Market difficulties for the ordinary new motor cars which are bought by the prosperous section of farmers, small and medium businessmen, salaried employees, and officials, began in the middle of the year; but in the market for expensive, luxury cars, which are bought by big businessmen, no sales difficulties have been noted up to the present.

Lenin pointed out that the final aim of production is always production of means of consumption. Means of production are produced only in order to produce means of consumption with their help. The overproduction of consumer goods, which was already evident at the beginning of 1953, inevitably leads also to overproduction of means of production, and to a fall in their production. And this is what has actually happened in the last two months of 1953. Production of steel, the chief material from which industrial

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equipment is made, fell by 22 per cent. in December, compared with the maximum (March). The number of active blast furnaces is decreasing daily. In the centre of the iron and steel industry—around Pittsburgh—only 19 out of 25 blast furnaces were working in the middle of December, 1953, and 11 out of 14 open hearth furnaces. Engineering works are reducing the number of workers. Thus the present crisis is developing along *'classical'* lines: the filling up of warehouses with goods, then a decrease in production of means of consumption, and finally, growth of crisis in the field of means of production.

All the facts point to the inevitability of a further fall in production in the U.S.A. (That, however, does not exclude an increase of production in particular months, as took place in August, 1953. The fall in production in times of crisis never proceeds uninterrupted.) This can be anticipated on the basis of the following *concrete* facts:—

(a) the total of unfulfilled orders of U.S. enterprises at the end of October, 1953, was $13,000 millions lower than at the end of October, 1952. This means a decrease of 18 per cent. The total of new orders in October was $2,000 millions lower than a year earlier. In November and December the position worsened still further.

(b) the sharp fall in production of steel means that a reduction is taking place in production of means of production. This is testified also by numerous reports in American newspapers of a reduction in production and by dismissal of workers in individual enterprises.

(c) in October, 1953, new housing begun was 10 per cent. lower than in October, 1952.

(d) commodity stocks of private entrepreneurs amounted to nearly $80,000 millions at the end of October.

Stock piles can be reduced only as a result of a decrease of production, of a fall in prices, and also partially, by means of their deterioration and destruction. Only thus—by means of a crisis—are normal relations between production and stocks of goods restored under capitalism.

Fall of Prices as a Sign of Crisis and a Factor in its Intensification

The big U.S. monopolies, in spite of overproduction, had maintained the prices of their goods up to the autumn of last year at a higher level than in 1952. But the prices of the goods of unmonopolised enterprises experienced a marked fall.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Prices of Typical Monopoly Commodities

	Sept. 1952	Sept. 1953	Percentage increase
Steel (dollars per ton) ...	66	81	23
Aluminium (cents per lb.)	20	21·5	7·5
Copper (cents per lb.) ...	24·2	29·6	21
Petrol (cents per gal.) ...	12·9	14·2	10
Sulphuric acid (dollars per ton)	20	22·35	11

There was no fall in the factory prices of new motor cars; and, of course, prices of armaments remained at a high level. This high price level in a number of basic branches of heavy industry is, of course, linked with the carrying out of the arms race policy. Quite a different situation exists for those commodities the prices of which the monopolists are trying to reduce. Since September, 1952, the buying price of cotton has fallen 16 per cent., wheat 9 per cent., beef 20 per cent., scrap iron 24 per cent. These facts, by the way, once again confirm how little average figures mean: the general index of U.S. wholesale prices was 107 in September, 1952, and 106 in September, 1953 (1948=100). As if nothing had changed. Actually the monopolies had raised prices of their goods in this period up to 20 per cent., in this way obtaining huge super-profits; but wholesale prices of farm produce fell 10-20 per cent., and hundreds of thousands of farmers were ruined.

However, since October-November, 1953, the big monopolies have had to take note of the existence of overproduction and to reduce their prices. The steel monopolies have, since October, been paying the cost of railway transport for delivery of goods, which buyers have had to pay before. The prices of several special sorts of high-grade steels have been reduced $2-$13 per ton. At the beginning of December the General Electric Company reduced the price of air-conditioning equipment by 25 per cent. The oil trusts have two or three times cut the prices of petrol. The big speculative builders have reduced the price of newly-built one-family houses from $24,500 to $22,500, but even then there are no buyers. All these facts confirm that militarisation of the national economy does not remove the inevitability of economic crisis. On the contrary, it leads to the growth of a new, profound economic crisis, and creates the conditions for its onset.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Increase of Unemployment and Poverty

The newspapers daily announce the mass dismissal of workers from enterprises in the motor car, aircraft, iron and steel and other industries. Only in the middle of November did official U.S. statistics for the first time admit a decrease during the month in the number of jobs, and an increase in the number of unemployed of 300,000. In December it was admitted that the number of unemployed rose by 422,000 persons. This is all the more significant, because in December the number of unemployed always decreases, since department stores, shops, clothing factories, etc. take on additional workers and shop assistants temporarily for the Christmas and New Year sales. In January of the present year, unemployment increased at no less a rate.

The number of unemployed officially amounts to only 1,850,000 persons. Actually it is several times greater. It is well known that American statistics do not count as unemployed those who have worked even one hour a week, and also those who are actually unemployed, but for whom a 'work place' has been kept or to whom work is promised in the course of the succeeding month. The information on dismissals does not square in any way with the official number of unemployed. It must also be taken into account that every year in the U.S.A. 700,000 youth begin work; but the number of employed workers, even by official figures, is less than last year. Short time is widespread. The average employment of workers in industry fell from 41·7 hours a week in December, 1952, to 39·9 hours in December, 1953. Enterprises are closed several days a week, etc. As a result average weekly earnings of employed workers had already fallen by two dollars a week between March and September, 1953. At the same time retail prices, especially of foodstuffs, have not been reduced, although wholesale prices are falling.

To sum up: the number of wholly unemployed has risen by at least a million persons; weekly earnings of employed workers have decreased by two dollars, while the cost of living has risen by two per cent in half a year. Even these figures are evidence that the U.S. working class is *already* experiencing a further fall in its standard of living as a result of the development of crisis phenomena. Of course, the worsening of the workers' position will lead to a fall in their purchasing power and above all to a fall in demand for manufactured goods which is a factor in intensifying the crisis.

* * *

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the end of December, 1953, a conference of 300 leading American economists recognised at last, under pressure of the facts, that a period of 'recession' had begun. The economists declared that in 1954 the national income will be five per cent. less than in 1953, that the value of industrial production will decline by $20,000—$25,000 millions, and that the index of industrial production will fall 10-15 per cent. Of the 300 economists, including 100 working in state institutions, only half-a-dozen expressed the view that 1954 production would begin to increase. The overwhelming majority had to admit the inevitability of the fall continuing even into 1955.

Of course, it is difficult to paint an exact picture of the further development of crisis phenomena in the complex present-day circumstances of the ever greater intensification of the general crisis of capitalism. But one thing is clear—the crisis of overproduction in the United States is becoming to an even greater extent an actually operative factor.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

PARASITES

The coalowners' defeat of the miners in 1926, and the unremitting guerilla warfare that they have carried on since then, has enabled the cost of production to be reduced to an 'economic level in relation to the world price', in the words of Evan Williams, the President of the Mining Association. The reduction is in effect entirely at the expense of wages; a comparison of the third quarters of 1925 and 1928 is instructive in this connection. It shows that while total costs of production per ton have been reduced by some 3s. 7d., of this no less than 3s. 3d. is represented by reduction in wages cost. Miners' wages are now nearly £17,000,000 a year less than before the lockout; it is worth adding in parenthesis that the royalty-owning parasites have suffered no reduction in the £6,000,000 that they suck annually from the industry.

From *Coal, Charity and the Class Struggle*, by Allen Hutt, March, 1929.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PORTRAIT OF A RULING CLASS

MONICA FELTON

WHEN Duff Cooper died his autobiography* was already a best-seller. On his death a potted version was serialised in the *Daily Express*. The paper's millions of readers were treated, every day for a week, to thin, rich slices of high society romance. Soulful, if rather dated, pictures of Lady Diana Cooper in the head-dress of a nun added a nice touch of solemnity to the Ouida-esque story of a duke's daughter who went to Hollywood and became a film star, and so managed to earn the money that was needed to launch her husband on a political career. The career itself was skimmed over rather lightly, leaving Duff Cooper himself to be remembered by *Daily Express* readers, if they remember him at all, as the one member of the Chamberlain government who resigned in protest against the Munich agreement.

In fact, Duff Cooper was a man who deserves to be remembered, and to be remembered for his honesty. That honourable resignation is perhaps the smaller of the two services for which history will owe him a debt. The other is the autobiography itself. It is probably the most instructive picture of the habits, tastes and political idiosyncracies of the rulers of Britain during the first half of the twentieth century that has ever been recorded, and it is all the more valuable because the most significant revelations seem to have been made without any real understanding of their importance. Since many of the major characters in the book are still alive, and the most important of them are still ruling this country, it is not only future historians who can benefit from Duff Cooper's candour. The facts for which the *Daily Express* could not—presumably—afford the space are facts which everybody ought to know.

The background is important. Duff Cooper's grandmother, on his mother's side, was one of the ten children whom the notorious Mrs. Jordan bore to King William IV. His uncle married the daughter of King Edward VII and was, apparently in consequence, created a duke. His father's family was much less grand, and his father himself was a surgeon, successful enough to be able to send his son to Eton and to New College, Oxford, but not sufficiently rich

**Old Men Forget*, by Lord Norwich (Alfred Duff Cooper). (399 pp. Hart-Davis. 21s.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to endow him with the large private income which was needed by a young man wishing to enter the diplomatic service. Instead, the young Duff Cooper sat for the examination for candidates for the Foreign Office, and, at his second attempt, passed. From then on his life was spent, in the most literal sense, as a member of the governing class. Before the first World War—at a time when he was still an inexperienced civil servant—his friends included many of the leading figures in the Liberal Party, among them the Asquiths, Edwin Montagu, Augustine Birrell and Winston Churchill. Later, when he entered Parliament—which he did as Conservative member for Oldham in 1924—his circle included Lord Beaverbrook, Oliver Stanley, Lord Salisbury, Anthony Eden and Harold Macmillan. In spite of his Liberal friends he was, he emphasises, always a Tory, and he imagined himself to be a Die-hard until he found that the Die-hards in the House of Commons were not, as he had romantically imagined, the descendants of those who had supported Pitt against Fox, Wellington against Grey and Disraeli against Gladstone but, instead, 'business men who had recently made fortunes, often by methods that did not invite close scrutiny'.

His own tastes were those of a class whose fortunes had been made so long ago that their origins were no longer an embarrassment, and though he himself was not well off he shared the prejudices of his aristocratic friends. He granted that women could be intelligent, and even influential in public affairs, but that Parliament, as a man-made institution, was no place for them: '. . . women cannot excel there any more than they can on the football field'. He hated socialism, and thought the very notion of equality nonsensical. He enjoyed spending Saturday to Monday (the vulgarity of the term 'week-end' is never allowed to smirch his impeccable vocabulary) in great country houses, and learned from experience that moments of acute political or personal anxiety could be to some extent eased by a good dinner and well-chosen wine. He read poetry and occasionally wrote it, though not very well. He was never quite at ease with people of humbler social origins than his own, and when he stood for Oldham he was dismayed at being obliged to visit factories:

> Not only do factories fail to interest me but they embarrass me, for I feel that I should ask intelligent questions and I fear that if I try to do so I shall betray not only laughable ignorance but also inattention to something that has just been explained. If, however, I had to name my favourite form of factory I should certainly select a cotton mill . . . the noise is such as to preclude conversation, the temperature is warm, the smell is pleasant, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rosy faces of the girls whose complexion has benefited from the soft damp air of Lancashire, turn the drab factory precincts into a garden of flowers.

Within the limitations imposed by this outlook and background Duff Cooper was also a patriot. The most active years of his life, before, during and after the Second World War were pre-occupied with the problem of preserving Britain's independence. His resignation after the humiliation of Munich was not an isolated action. It was the result of a consistent outlook: of an outlook which made him capable of sacrificing personal interests—though not, as he reveals, the interests of the class to which he belonged—to what he saw as the welfare of the nation. The last chapters of the book show that this same outlook was responsible for his attempts to influence Ernest Bevin's foreign policy from the time when the Labour Government came into power until Bevin dismissed him from his post as British Ambassador in Paris in 1947. Duff Cooper is generally labelled a Franco-phil, but it is perfectly clear from the documents which he quotes that his advocacy of an alliance with France was based on an appraisal of British interests with which no one capable of facing realities could honestly disagree: namely, fear of American domination of Britain and western Europe, and fear of revival of German militarism. Much as Duff Cooper disliked Communism he refused to accept the myth of a 'Russian menace', and he believed that Bevin, whom he did not find in other respects altogether congenial, shared this view with him. He was therefore surprised and puzzled when, soon after the signing of the Treaty of Dunkirk, Bevin sent him, without explanation, a letter of dismissal. After that he went into retirement.

Men who fight for a principle must fight not only as a gesture to their own self-respect, but with a determination to win. And they cannot hope or expect to win unless they are prepared to put their principles before any other consideration. Measured by this standard Duff Cooper was a failure. He was a failure not merely because circumstances were against him, but because the practice of his principles, honourable in themselves, would have involved him in a breach of loyalty to his class. The same can be said of Eden's resignation. Eden, too, resigned on a question of principle, but, in spite of the enhanced moral status which his resignation gave him in the eyes of the British people, the principle itself suffered defeat. The great value of Duff Cooper's book is that it shows, not analytically but in plain statements of fact, exactly how these defeats came about.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

First, Eden. On February 13, 1938, Duff Cooper wrote in his diary:

> The press this week have got hold of a quite untrue story that there is a profound disagreement between Anthony and the Prime Minister over friendship with Italy. There is no foundation for it.

'In this case', Duff Cooper comments, 'the press was better informed than the Cabinet Minister'—and he was astonished to be summoned to a Cabinet meeting and to be informed there that the 'untrue' story was, in fact, well-founded. On most questions of foreign policy he himself had always agreed with Eden's point of view, and had supported him in the Cabinet whenever it was necessary. On Italy the two men differed. Duff Cooper was not a member of the Foreign Policy Committee of the Cabinet, and did not know all the facts. Neither he nor Eden knew that while Chamberlain was professing to try to retain Eden in the Cabinet he was intriguing behind his back: 'determined to get rid of him, and had secretly informed the Italian Ambassador that he hoped to succeed in doing so'. But though Eden did not know how he himself was being betrayed by the Prime Minister he did know how British interests were being betrayed by policies that had been adopted without his knowledge or consent. That, after all, was why he resigned, and Duff Cooper admits that if Eden had tried to win his support at the time he would probably have succeeded. Yet his comment on Eden's conduct ignores the great issues that were at stake, and the public responsibilities of a man charged with the conduct of his country's foreign policy:

> It is much to his (Eden's) credit that he abstained from all lobbying of opinion and sought to gain no adherents either in the Cabinet or in the House of Commons.

In short, Eden behaved like what is commonly called an English gentleman. He knew himself to be right. Yet, though he resigned rather than carry out a policy which he knew to be wrong, he apparently did not even try to influence colleagues whose support might have secured a change in that policy and so made his resignation unnecessary. The whole business was, of course, very embarrassing to the government, and if two ministers, instead of one, had resigned, the government might have fallen. Even as it was, the Tory leaders were afraid that it might. But loyalty won. Toryism at home was made safe once more: at what cost, not only to the world but to the people of this country, we all now know.

So much for Eden.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What about Duff Cooper himself? He was consistent, from the beginning, in his opposition to the policy that led to Munich, and, unlike Eden, he did not fight his battles alone, though of course the majority of his colleagues in the Cabinet were against him. Among those who (according to his own account) seem to have shared his views were apparently Earl De La Warr, Hore-Belisha, Walter Elliot and Oliver Stanley. On September 16, when Chamberlain was on the way back from his meeting with Hitler and Berchtesgaden:

> Eddie Winterton came to see me at the Admiralty. He fears the government will show weakness and thinks that those who differ from them must press their views to the point of resignation.

On September 24, after the Cabinet meeting at which Chamberlain reported on his visit to Godesberg:

> Hailsham gave me a lift as far as the Admiralty. I said that I didn't think we could ever get the Prime Minister's policy through the House of Commons. To my surprise he said at once: 'Of course you can't', and went on to tell me of the strength of feeling at Oxford, where his son is standing as a parliamentary candidate, among all parties against surrender.

Then came Munich. As soon as the terms were announced in the papers on the morning of September 30, Duff Cooper decided that he could not agree to them and must resign. He went to the Board of Trade to see Oliver Stanley, who, through the whole course of the negotiations, had shared Duff Cooper's views and said that if a dishonourable capitulation was made he would resign, too. And this is what happened:

> Walter Elliot was there. They are both of opinion that we should accept these terms. Walter said that if I went he felt he ought to go too. I said that was not my view. It would be easier for me to go alone, as I had no wish to injure the Government, which I should not do if my resignation were the only one. We talked at some length and reached no conclusion.

And so, after another twenty-four hours of indecision, Duff Cooper resigned: alone. Again, personal honour was satisfied, and a policy of disgrace and dishonour comfortably saved. The parting with Chamberlain was friendly. The King 'was frank and charming. He said that he could not agree with me, but he respected those who had the courage of their convictions'. Those who remained in the government were not blamed 'for being able to accept a little more than I could'. As for Oliver Stanley:

> Oliver was also suffering at the time from a deep personal anxiety. His elder brother, Edward, who had only recently joined the Cabinet, was dying, and his father, Lord Derby, was an enthusiastic supporter of the Prime Minister, and would have been deeply grieved by his resignation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lord Hailsham turned out to be wrong; but though Parliament did not behave as he had predicted, but, instead, greeted Neville Chamberlain with the most disgraceful display of hysterical relief ever witnessed, there were many members, not all of whom agreed with what he had done, who congratulated Duff Cooper on his courage: among them Churchill, Harold Macmillan, Josiah Wedgwood and Malcolm MacDonald. But we, living in a world these men have made, may well ask what kind of courage and what kind of convictions are responsible for conduct such as this? Fortunately Duff Cooper has answered the question for us. He has shown exactly how, and with what excuses and justifications, the interests of class and the determination to retain power at all costs over-rode, in one of the greatest crises in the history of this country, every other consideration. It is a classic example, and one which we cannot afford to forget.

Book Reviews

ON MALTHUS

Marx and Engels on Malthus, selections from the writings of Marx and Engels dealing with the theories of Thomas Robert Malthus, edited with an introductory essay and notes by Ronald L. Meek; translations from the German by Dorothea L. Meek and R. L. Meek (190 pp. Lawrence & Wishart. *15s.*)

MALTHUS is chiefly known, and in his day was hated, for his *Essay on Population*, first published in the years following the French Revolution, to confound in particular the proposals for the rational reform of human society advanced by the bourgeois radical Godwin. Marx spoke of it (in a passage printed in this collection) as 'a tract against the French Revolution and the contemporary ideas of reform in England (Godwin, etc.). It was an apology for the poverty of the working classes.' It was used in the first part of the 19th century to oppose every measure, whether of public action or private philanthropy, to ameliorate the wretched condition of the working class and of the dispossessed *petite bourgeoisie* (hand loom weavers, smallholders, etc.), and after a temporary eclipse it is being revived today by publicists and even by men of science to buttress an attitude of defeatism towards measures for the social and economic improvement of the peoples of 'backward countries'. Malthus is less well-known as a writer on general questions of economic theory and of economic policy (he was from 1806 onwards Professor of Political Economy at East India Company's College at Haileybury in Hertfordshire). On matters of economic policy he stood, in opposition to Ricardo, as a defender of the Corn Laws in the controversies of 1815; and in economic theory he stood as a defender of Adam Smith against Ricardo's critique of the latter, sponsoring in particular a supply and demand theory as against a labour theory of value and attributing 'gluts' of commodities to underconsumption, for which he saw the remedy in nursing a class of 'unproductive consumers' (meaning chiefly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

landlords). In this connection the editor cites in his introduction the important but too-little known passage on crises and underconsumption in Lenin's *Characterisation of Economic Romanticism*. Marx characterised, again, Malthus' *Essay on Rent* as 'a tract on behalf of the landlords against industrial capital' and his *Principles of Political Economy* as 'a tract in the interests of the capitalists against the workers and in the interests of the aristocracy, the Church, and the "tax-devourers", etc., against the capitalists'.

Dr. Meek has had the excellent idea of collecting together the main passages in the writings of Marx and Engels which refer to Malthus. The result is a very judicious selection, well and fully annotated, to which the editor has added a lucid introductory essay of his own on Malthus yesterday and today. The selection ranges from early articles of Marx and Engels in 1844 (including Engels' 'Outline of a Critique of Political Economy' in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*) to passages from *Anti-Dühring* and *Dialectics of Nature* and from letters of Engels to Kautsky and Danielson in 1881 and 1895. The collection is divided into three parts. The first (Part Two) includes references to Malthus' theory of population; the second (Part Three) consists of three hitherto untranslated sections on Malthus' economic theory in general from Marx's *Theories of Surplus Value* (Vols. II and III of the Kautsky edition); and the third (Part Four) of references by Marx and Engels to Darwinism and Society and the relation between Darwin and Malthus. Some of the passages in Parts Two and Four are familiar ones, such as those from the *Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*, two excerpts from *Capital* and one

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

Established 1936

Volume XVIII, Number 1,

Winter, 1954

The Legend of Isolationism in the 1920's

William Appleman Williams

* * *

Malthus : Yesterday and Today

Ronald L. Meek

* * *

Humor in the Music of Stravinsky and Prokofiev

Norman Cazden

* * *

Book Reviews by

D. N. Pritt,
Charles Humboldt,
William Hammock,
Ernest F. Patterson,
Bernard Mandel,
Richard Griffin,
Eric J. Hobsbawm,
Arthur K. Davis,
Michael J. David,
A. Jaspan.

* * *

Quarterly, 50 cents Single Copy
(75 cents foreign)
$2.00 per year ($2.50 foreign)

SCIENCE & SOCIETY, Inc.

30, East 20th St., New York 3, N.Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* (the important one repudiating Lassalle's 'iron law of wages'), and the passages on Darwinism in *Anti-Dühring* and *Dialectics of Nature*. But there are also several important new excerpts not previously in English, in addition to those from *Theories of Surplus Value*: of these the reader's attention should be drawn both to the 1844 articles and to a letter to Kautsky of 1881, containing (as the editor notes) 'some interesting comments on the question of population in a communist society'. Of special interest is also Engels' letter to Lavrov of November 12, 1875, which first appeared in English in the *Labour Monthly* in 1936, translated and annotated by Dona Torr. Altogether a most valuable, as well as handy, collection on which both editor and translators (the editor and his wife) are to be congratulated.

M.H.D.

STORY OF DOCKLAND

Rising Tide, by Jack Lindsay. (272 pp. Bodley Head. *12s. 6d.*)

A BETTER title of the novel by Jack Lindsay could not have been chosen. We are experiencing today a continuity of the tide that is rising in defence of economic, social and cultural conditions. It gives to workers a proud feeling of their class and a confidence that come what may they are the future heirs of their land. Like his *Betrayed Spring*, *Rising Tide* blows fresh and clean.

This story of Dockland, its men and women, their families, their difficulties, the row that goes on between Mr. and Mrs. Tremaine, their son Herb who was sent to a reformatory school, the one or two rooms they are living in—all arises out of the economic conditions they are living under brought about by the political system of society under which we live. Past memories will be revived for the thousands that will read the novel, of the struggles of their parents and their families. They will say this was their life; this is our life today; the novel is life itself. From their point of view, Jack Lindsay is helping people to understand themselves, and for people to understand people. Then there is the every-day struggle on the job to see that working rates and conditions are observed, that men who have given their whole lives to the industry are protected from being sacked as so-called 'ineffectives'. Side by side with this there is also the feeling and support for the striking Canadian seamen, the attempt to get Port-workers to blackleg fellow trade unionists from another land being defeated, and then comes the challenge: all men are returned to the central call. The call is, 'you will man the Canadian ships or else not one man moves'. A blow is struck for international trade union solidarity. The struggle goes from strength to strength. The shipowners, their right-wing lackeys, the treacherous leaders of the Labour Government are forced to retreat.

The novel has also its lighter side on the engagement and subsequent marriage of Mrs. Tremaine's daughter Phil to Jeff who is a Docker and the celebration with its songs and speeches. I am sure all who read this novel will thoroughly enjoy it, and will feel a part of it.

TED DICKENS

CORRECTION: In February issue, page 88, line 18, read 'desired' instead of 'denied'.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have come from the West and the North; so I looked to see if the trend were the same among those asking us to send Specimen Copies to their friends (See back cover for form). Sure enough. During 1953 most requests came from London (21%), then the North (17%) and Midlands (15%), with the West (10%) only in fifth place. But so far in 1954 the North (38%) has taken the lead and the West (23%) has jumped to second place.

A Freshman?

I WAS GLAD to see quite a few requests to send specimen copies coming in from students. I notice that one was from a recent subscriber who only a few weeks ago was himself sent a specimen copy; now he is getting after others. Youth doesn't dilly dally! Meanwhile from all sorts of places we get letters like this from Sussex: 'I made a new reader by passing over my January copy and so have a gap in my file. Here's 2s. 6d. for a replacement and a bit over for the fund.'

How Jock First Saw It

AMONG THE NEW subscriptions sent in I see one that comes from a shop steward on behalf of a workmate. Which reminds me of the story of a bet. Some months ago there was a heated workshop discussion about the exact terms of the Potsdam Agreement on Germany. Reader Ted finally exclaimed: 'I'll prove it to you tomorrow.' Said Jock: 'Bet a quid you can't!' Done! Bright and early next day Ted brings in the L.M. for September, 1945, which carried as a *Document of the Month* the text of the Berlin agreement. As the quid changed hands he said: 'You can take this magazine regularly from now on, Jock, and this is payment on account.' So that was how Jock first saw L.M.

A Fair Start

ANOTHER PARENT has turned up who wants to give a fair start to the younger generation. He asks us to put 'my donation in the name of my small son in future.' Total gifts received during January were:

£62 19s. 3d.

STAND-IN MONEY came from: 'Billie', standing-in for Tonypandy 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s.; 'Bath', standing-in for Aylesbury, Pontypridd, Totnes, Warwick and Watford, 10s.; 'American Observers', standing-in for British Guiana, 'in memory of Toussaint L'Ouverture', £1.

STEADY MONEY came from: 'Cardiff', £2; Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s.; J.L., 'Central Edinburgh', £1 4s.; A.M.T. for Fernando, Portugal, 1s.; Niall, 'Belfast', 3s.; P.O'H., 'Dublin', 2s.; 'Bath', 10s.; 'Exeter', £1; J.H., 'Ipswich', 5s.; 'New York' (pre-paid); M. Philibert (pre-paid); 'Socialist Sailor', £1; 'Red Sergeant', 5s.; 'Jon', 10s.; H.G.B., 4s. 6d.; D.F.O., 12s.; J. Macdonald, 4s.; D. M. Clarke, 10s.; E. D. McCallum, 5s.; D. Mayo, 2s.; R.F.B., £3; S. Mill, £1; The Humphreys Family, 4s.; H. Tinkler, 7s.; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 5s.; T.W.R., £1; 'L'Humanite', 3s.; R. McLeod, 5s.; S. Morrissy, 10s.; E.J.B., 10s.; P. N. Brinson, 10s.; J. A. Purton, 7s. 6d.; Olivia Greene, £2.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: J. McCallum, 2s. 8d.; P. W. Ghosh, 2s.; J. H. Wilson, 1s.; D. I. P. Rees, 2s.; J. S. Richardson, 2s.; G. J. Davies, 1s.; R. Greenham, 1s.; M. E. Diplock, 2s.; S. Goodall, 1s.; W. J. Fairman, 1s.; J. N. F. Newall, 2s.; L. Shapiro, 12s.; M. Hurwitt, 2s.; D. A. Newson, 2s.; F. Humphreys, 2s.; T. Chapman, 1s.; R. M. Lang, 12s.; L. T. Thatcher, 2s.; W. S. Hemp, 12s.; R. G. Hartshorn, 6s. 6d.; P. H. Plumb, £1 2s.; S. H. Moore, 2s.; B. Becker, £1; S. Harrison, 2s.; A. L. Beak, 7s.; T. Dewhurst, 12s.; J. M. Higgington, 2s.; H. J. P. Webb. 1s.; N. L. Wilkinson, 2s.; T. Senior, 10s.; D. Spencer, 2s.; J. A. Fraser, 5s.; D. H. Strathern, 2s.; A. Opulski, 5s.; J. Gray, 2s.; J. Bacon, 3s. 6d.; M. Robinson, 2s.; M. Hall, £1; W. M. Gaze, 10s.; C. Moss, £1 5s.; F. Gubb, 7s.; L. Barnes, £1 2s.; J. Anderson, 2s.; J. Ponsonby, £6; R. Brown, 2s.; G. R. Sandison, 7s.; J.C., £9 2s.; J. C. McAlister, 7s.; F. A. Farrow, 2s.; H. Pyne, 2s.; Anon (Cheshire), 3s.; F. Hughes, 2s.; S. Auyaktananda, 5s.; F. Wignall, 2s.; A. Rahman, 1s.; D. Lewis, 11s. 6d.; W. Scobell, £2 2s.; R. J. Rose, 2s.; E. Jemmett, 1s.; H. F. Ludford, 5s.; Anon, 1s.; H. R. Davies, 7s.; Anon (Burton), 1s.; A. Collindridge, 2s.; T. Gittins, 2s.; W. A. Topham, 2s.; W. Gregory, 2s.; E. Sutcliffe, 5s.; G. P. Horstead, 5s.; B. Robshaw, 2s.; R. W. Davies, 2s.; D. Flinn, 2s.; 'Gerr', 1s.; E.S. (U.S.A.), £2 5s. 7d.; L.F.P. (U.S.A.), 10s. 6d.; H.Z. (U.S.A.), £4 7s. 6d.; R.B. (Canada), 7s. 2d.; A.R. (U.S.A.), 10s. 4d.

Our thanks to you all.

Co-op. No.: L99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballard's Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST?

Here's the Subscription Form:

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

I wish to become a postal subscriber and enclose 18s. (home) $3.00 (U.S.A. and Canada), 19s. (elsewhere) for a year, beginning with the.....issue.

(SIGNED) .....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

COLLET'S BOOKSHOPS

Read the Russian point of view in

NEWS

The fortnightly Soviet review of world events

PRICE SIXPENCE

You can now order NEWS from any newsagent in Britain. Ask your newsagent to get you a copy.

In case of difficulties contact

COLLET'S BOOKSHOPS
45, Museum Street, London, W.C.1.

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

The Progressive Newsweekly

Authoritative voice of the American progressive movement

Edited by CEDRIC BELFRAGE

Annual Subscription 24s.

ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1.

LABOUR RESEARCH

March issue includes:

"Food Prices and Subsidies"
"The Future of the Slums"
"Prospects for the British Economy"

Monthly, 9d.; p.a., 10s. 6d.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2, Soho Square, London, W.1.

FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy to:—

(1) Name .....
Address .....

(2) Name .....
Address .....

You may mention my name, or/I enclose note to be sent on.

Signed .....
Address .....
.....

TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED